arXiv:physics/9903011v3 [physics.gen-ph] 14 Jul 1999

Which Physics Laws are Deduced from the Logic Properties of the Information?

G.Quznetsov
quznets@geocities.com

February 2, 2008

Abstract

The relativity theory principles and the quants theory principles are deduced from logic properties of the information, obtained from a physics device.

This paper presents a logic development of the Bergson [1], Whitehead [2], Capek [3][4], Stapp [5]-[8], Whipple [9] ideas on "... events must be treat as the fundamental objective constituents ... events and not particles constituite the true objective reality"[10]. (The A.Jadczyk and Ph.Blanchard papers [11]-[13] are related to this topic for some time past.):

An information, which is obtained from a physics device $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}$, can be expressed by a set $\mathbf{a}$ of any language sentences. The set $\mathbf{a}$ is denoted as "the recorder of the device $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}$". The set of the recorders call into existence structures, similar to a clocks . The following results are deduced from the logic properties of the recorders set [14]:

First, all such clocks have got the same direction, i.e. if the event, expressed by the sentence A, precedes to the event, expressed by the sentence B, with respect to any such clock, then it is the same for all other such clocks.

Second, the Time, defined by such clocks, proves irreversible, i.e. no the recorder can obtain the information, that a certain event has taken place, before it has actually taken place. Thus, nobody can return back into the Past Times or obtain the information from the Future Times.

Third, the set of recorders has been embedded in the metric space by some natural method; i.e. all metric space axioms are obtained from the logic properties of the recorder set.

Fourth, if this metric space proves to be the Euclidean space, then the corresponding recorders "space-time" obeys the Poincare complete group transformations. I.e. in this case the Special Theory Relativity follows from the logic properties of the information. If this metric space is not Euclidean, then any non-linear geometry exists on the space of the recorders, and any variant of the General Relativity Theory can be realized on this space.

Therefore, the principal time properties - the one-dimensionality and the irreversibility -, the space metric properties and the spatial-temporal principles of the theory of the relativity are deduced from the logic properties of the recorders set. Hence, if you have got any set of the objects, which able to get, to keep and/or to give any information, then "the time" and "the space" are inevitable on this set. And it is all the same: or this set is in our world or this set is in any other worlds, in which the spatial- temporal structure does not exist initially. Hence, the spatial-temporal structure arises from the logic properties of the information.

There is the evident nigh affinity between the classical probability function and the Boolean function of the classical propositional logic [15]. These functions are differed by the range of value, only. That is if the range of values of the Boolean function shall be expanded from the two-elements set $\{0; 1\}$ to the segment $[0; 1]$ of the real numeric axis then the logic analog of the Bernoulli Large Number Law can be deduced from the logic axioms. And if the range of values of such function shall be expanded to the segment of some suitable variant of the hyperreal numeric axis then this theorem shall insert some statistical meaning for this function [16].

The probability must comply with certain simple condition in order to be expressed by a relativistic $\mu + 1$-vector of the probability density [17]. Such probability is denoted as "the trackelike probability". The Dirac equation is deduced from such probability properties by the Poincare group transformations [18] [19]. Hence the physics elementary particle behavior in the vacuum looks like to the trackelike probability behavior. In the two- slits experiment if the partition with two slits between the source of the physics particle and the detecting screen exists in the vacuum then the interference of the probability is observed. But if this system shall be placed in the Wilson cloud chamber then the particle shall got the clear trace, marked by the condensate drops, and whole interference shall vanished. It looks like to the following: the physics particle exists in the moment, only, in which some event on this particle is happening. And in other times this particle does not exist and the probability of some event on this particle exists, only.

Hence, if an events on this particle do not happen between the event-birth and the event-detection then the particle behavior is the probability behavior between these events, and the interference is visible. But in the Wilson cloud chamber, where the ionization acts form the almost continuous line, the particle has got the clear trace and no the interference. And the particle moves because such line is not absolutely continuous. Every point of the ionization act has got the neighboring ionization point, and the event on this particle is not happen between these points. Therefore, the physics particle moves because the corresponding probability is propagated in the space between these points.

Therefore a particle is an ensemble of events, bounded by a probabilities (that is similar to [20]).

In the $3+1$ space-time all interactions between fermions can be expressed by some division algebra (the Cayley algebra) but such algebra does not exist in thespace- time with more than $3+1$ dimension [21]. Hence the fermions can not go out from this $3+1$ space-time.

Thus particles and fields are not the basic entities of Universe but the logic events and the logic probabilities are the basic entities. Universe - i.e. the time, the space and whole their contents - is the by-product of the deduction from the logic events.

References

[1] H. Bergson. *Creative Evolution.* Greenwood press, Wesport, Conn., (1975)

[2] A. N. Whitehead. *Process and Reality.*
Ed. D. R. Griffin and D. W. Sherburne. The Free Press, N.Y. (1978)

[3] M. Capek. *The Philosophical Impact of Contemporary Physics.* D.Van Nostrand, Princeton, N.J. (1961)

[4] M. Capek. Particles or events. in *Physical Sciences and History of Physics.* Ed. R. S. Cohen and M. W. Wartorsky. Reidel, Boston, Mass. (1984), p.1.

[5] H. P. Stapp. Phys. Rev. D. **3.** 1303 (1971)

[6] H. P. Stapp. Nuovo Cimento B, **29**, 270 (1973)

[7] H. P. Stapp. Found. Phys. **7**, 313 (1977)

[8] H. P. Stapp. Found. Phys. **9**. 1 (1979)

[9] E. C. Whipple jr. Nuovo Cimento A, 11, **92** (1986)

[10] J. Jeans. *The New Background of Science*. Macmillan, N. Y. (1933)

[11] Ph. Blanchar and A. Jadczyk. *Theory of Events*. Los Alamos e-print Archive quant-ph/9504005 (1995)

[12] Ph. Blanchar and A. Jadczyk. *Relativistic Quantum Events*. quant-ph/9610028 (1996)

[13] Ph. Blanchar and A. Jadczyk. *A Way Out of the Quantum Trap*. quant-ph/9610028 (1998)

[14] G. Quznetsov. physics/9901039

[15] for instance: Rodger C. Lindon. *Notes on Logic*. D. VAN NOSTRAND COMPANY, INC. (1966)

[16] G. Quznetsov. physics/9808050

[17] physics/9803035

[18] physics/9805004

[19] physics/9902032

[20] Markus Simonius. Helvetica Physica Acta, **66** (1993) 721. and quant-ph/9811074

[21] G. Quznetsov. physics/9806007, physics/9805004 and hep-ph/9812339